

ORIGINAL PAPERS,

RELATIVE TO THE

PRESENT APPLICATION

TO THE

BRITISH PARLIAMENT

FOR RELIEF OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLICS

IN ENGLAND.

VIZ:

- | | |
|--|---|
| I. A Letter to the four Vicars Apostolic in England, from the Roman Catholic Committee, Feb. 1791. | V. The Letter of the Staffordshire Roman Catholic Clergy to the Hon. Thomas Talbot. |
| II. The Form of the Oath as first proposed to be taken. | VI. The Protestation of the Roman Catholics of England. |
| III. The Encyclical Letter of the Vicars Apostolic, dated January 19th, 1791. | VII. Abstracts from the Opinions of Foreign Universities. |
| IV. Their former Encyclical Letter, dated October 21st, 1789. | VIII. The Bill as presented to the British Parliament. |
| | IX. A List of the Controversial Publications on the foregoing Subjects. |

DUBLIN:

WILLIAM JONES, NO. 86, DAME-STREET.

MDCCXCI.

ORIGINAL PAPERS, &c.

No. I.

To the Right Reverend CHARLES, *Lord Bishop of Rama*, Vicar Apostolic of the Western District;—WILLIAM, *Lord Bishop of Acanthos*, Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District;—JOHN, *Lord Bishop of Centuria*, Vicar Apostolic of the Southern District, of England :

My Lords, !

THE Bill, for the relief of the English Catholics, being soon to be brought into the House of Commons*, and your Lordships persisting in declaring the Oath enjoined to be taken by that Bill, (—a copy of which Oath† is annexed to this instrument,—) to be unlawful—We the underwritten, CLERGY and LAITY, appointed under an unanimous resolution of the General Meeting of the English Catholics, on the 3d day of May 1787, (convened after a public and printed notice universally circulated,) to be a

B COMMITTEE

* Scil. of Great Britain. Editor. † A copy of the bill presented to parliament is also here annexed. Edit.

COMMITTEE to watch over and promote the public interests of the English Catholics, think it incumbent upon us to present to your Lordships, *this*, our SOLEMN DECLARATION and PROTESTATION.

If the Oath contained an avowal of any point of doctrine or morals contrary to the belief of the Catholic Church, we should think it criminal in us, either to contend for its admissibility, in the present stage of the business, or to take it at a future time, if it should pass into a law.—For born and educated in the Catholic Church, we acknowledge ourselves bound by her decrees, and whatever is of faith, by the express word of Christ, or the tradition of his Church, we acknowledge it our duty to believe.

In common with every Church, in communion with the See of Rome, we acknowledge the Supremacy of the Pope. This, in the printed case, delivered by us to the members of both houses of Parliament, previously to any mention of our Bill in the house of Commons, we declared in the most explicit and unequivocal terms.

Before this,—having occasion to write to the Minister, on the 9th of May 1788, respecting his requisition to have the opinions of foreign Catholics on the Pope's *dispensing power*,—we sent him the treatise, entitled, “ROMAN CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES in reference to GOD and the COUNTRY,” and accompanied it by a letter, in which we signified it to be a summary of our tenets, which we assured him we were persuaded every Catholic would readily subscribe to.

The 5th article of the second section of this treatise is, in the following words: “Catholics believe, that, “the Bishop of Rome, successor of Saint Peter, is “the Head of the Catholic Church, in which sense “this Church may therefore fitly be stiled Roman “Catholic, being an universal body united under “one visible Head.”

Two hundred copies of this treatise have been distributed, by our direction, among members of the Established Church and Protestant Dissenters.

Thus publicly we have acknowledged ourselves members of the Catholic Church, and professed our belief of her doctrines, particularly that of the Pope's Supremacy. Neither national prejudice,—the fear of avowing ourselves objects of the many oppressive laws still remaining in force against us,—a timorous apprehension of the policy of the measure,—nor a caution, perhaps justifiable, of keeping from the public, what the public did not expressly call upon us to proclaim, withheld us from this open and unreserved declaration of our principles.—We were sensible of the duty owing by us to our Divine Legislator, of confessing him and his Church before men; at the same time we knew that none of our religious principles were incompatible with our duty, as men and citizens: we made no scruple, therefore, of proclaiming, thus publicly, before God and the Nation, the integrity of our religious principles; and having satisfied this obligation, we thought ourselves not only justified, but from the circumstances of the times, actually bound in duty to declare, with equal publicity, the integrity of our political principles.—With this view, under the sanction of all the Vicars Apostolic and all their Coadjutors, and upwards of two hundred of the Clergy, (the London Clergy particularly having been for that purpose regularly convened by their Bishop), we signed the Protestation*, and it was signed by almost every other Catholic of England, of any respectability. Having given to God and the nation these two solemn pledges both of our *religious* and our *political* integrity, shame be upon those who dare to call in question either the one or the other:—

B 2

other:—

* A copy of which protestation is hereunto annexed. Edit.

other:—we scorn the slander:—we know we are good Catholics, and good subjects.

We have apprized your lordships of every thing respecting the business, in its progress to its present stage. Your Lordships know, that, the Oath, when first altered from the Protestation, received the deliberate approbation of the late venerable Vicar of the London district; and that, as it now stands, it received, on the 3d of February 1790, the approbation of his most respectable brother, the Vicar Apostolic of the middle district, in the presence of 19 Clergymen.

Still your lordships denounce it to be unlawful to take the Oath; and you have publicly assumed to yourselves, to inhibit the flocks you are sent to govern from taking it; “and from taking any new Oath or signing any new declaration on doctrinal matters:—or subscribing any new instrument, wherein the interests of Religion are concerned, (—are your Lordships aware of the monstrous latitude of that expression?) “without the previous approbation of their respective Bishop.”

My Lords, if *Christ* enjoins submission, he enjoins it when submission is reasonable:—and submission must ever be unreasonable, when it is not preceded by instruction and reason.—Following the precept of her Divine Master, the Church of God, in tender regard to the weakness of her children, has generally condescended to conciliate,—has always thought herself bound to instruct.—It is a rule with her, that the lowest of her children should know of what he is accused, before he is judged; and be permitted to defend himself, before he is condemned.

Such, my Lords, is the spirit of our Divine Master; and such, conformably to his precepts, is the practice of his Church.—How widely different have been the proceedings of your Lordships! That Oath, which but a few months ago,

ago, under the sanction of a most deliberate and explicit approbation of our pastor, we had signified to be admissible ;—that Oath, which was grounded on the Protestation signed, but a few months ago, by all the Vicars Apostolic, all their Coadjutors, and with few exceptions indeed, by all their Clergy ;—that Oath, my Lords, without a specification of one single objectionable clause, was pronounced by your Lordships to be unlawful, and our conduct respecting it censured.

Thus, my Lords, in our regard, no preliminaries, either of form or of right, were attended to. No measure of conciliation was used,—no instruction was vouchsafed.—In which of the articles of the Oath, the error, attributed to it, lay, was not pointed out to us ; we were not permitted to explain it ;—no opportunity was given us to defend our conduct.—Is it possible to suppose your heavenly Master inspired a conduct so opposite to his own spirit, of prudence, meekness, conciliation and justice ; or that your Lordships spoke the language of the Church, when you acted in a manner so little conformable to its practice ?

My Lords, this is not all.—The same anathema, which is denounced in the scripture, against those who take from the word of God, is denounced against those who add to it.—We know the Gospel enjoins us to submit to the dogmatical decisions of the Church ; we also know the Gospel does not oblige us to admit as Faith the bare assertions of three only of its Ministers. Individual Prelates, even national Councils may err ; the Church alone is infallible. Respectable for your exemplary piety, your missionary zeal, and your many other moral and religious endowments, your Lordships are entitled to the utmost attention and respect. The utmost attention and respect we have ever paid, and shall ever pay you. When you deliver to

us the solemn decisions of the Church, when you exhort, persuade, or instruct, we know you are within the sphere of your pastoral duty, and we listen with reverence to the language of the gospel and tradition. But when you deliver mysterious oracles, and undertake to silence reason and preclude discussion, by the mere authority of your Encyclical letters, we cannot but recollect, that God and the whole collective body of the Church alone, are possessed of the right of propounding articles of belief.

Thus wandering from your proper direction, we are not surprized at your errors. We see without surprize, but with much real concern, that you are quite mistaken in your notions and statements of the principles of the Bill, and of our conduct respecting it ;—that you sign the Protestation one day, retract it the next ;—formally disapprove of provisos in the intended Act, and forget that more exceptionable provisos were inserted in the Act passed for the relief of the Irish Catholics, in 1778.

Surely, my Lords, when your Lordships act with so much precipitancy, when you shew such little attention to the forms or the substance of justice, when you shew yourselves so unconvertant with the subjects on which you pronounce your determinations so decisively ; when there is so much contradiction in your opinions, and so much disagreement among yourselves ; it is possible to call in question the irrefragability of your articles and determinations without incurring the guilt of heresy, schism, or disobedience. For it is evident, under these circumstances, you are not to be considered as the Church : you are but a part of the Church : as such, you are entitled to attention and respect. —But where reason is not satisfied, where conviction has not preceded, God and the collective body of his Church alone, have a right to require submission : when, under these circumstances, it is required by any other, it cannot be

be that rational submission which Christ authorizes his ministers to require: and when there is so great a misapprehension of authority, there cannot but be a strong presumption, that there is an equal misapprehension of the subject to which it is applied.

To support your Lordships' requisition to submission, the only argument brought by your Lordships is, that "you are the Vicars Apostolic of this country;—are therefore the highest ecclesiastical authority in this country; your decrees, therefore, 'till they are reversed by an higher authority, in this country, must be submitted to."

Permit us, my Lords, to enquire if your Lordships seriously considered the above proposition before you asserted it? The constitution of the Church and the histories of every age, and almost every realm of Christendom, prove its erroneousness.

† In the year 519, under the pontificate of Pope Hormisdas, a dispute arose on the proposition, "One of the Trinity has been crucified for our salvation." The affirmative was supported by the Monks of Scythia; Pope Hormisdas was consulted upon it:—he severely censured the Monks for maintaining it; he called them obstinate and turbulent men, that despised the authority of the holy Fathers; complained he could not stop their extravagancies by his admonitions, his mildness, or his authority, and said, they ought to be shunned. About 12 years after, Pope John the II. pronounced in favour of their proposition, and the whole Church acquiesced in his decision. But permit us, my Lords, to ask, whether, during the interval between the censure of Hormisdas and the approbation of John, ratified by the subsequent consent of the universal

† See the *Défense de la Déclaration de l'Assemblée du clergé de France*,—particularly lib. 9.

Church, it was lawful for any Christian, of any part of the world, to deny the lawfulness of the proposition in question, though the unlawfulness of it was maintained by the Bishop of Rome, the highest authority, except that of the Universal Church, in the Christian world.

In 633, Cyrus, Patriarch of Alexandria, the first of the Monothelites, published a decree, in which he laid it down, that in Jesus Christ there was but one operation of the will. This doctrine was received by Sergius, the Patriarch of Constantinople. Sophronius, afterwards Patriarch of Jerusalem, rejected this profane novelty with horror. The Patriarch Sergius sent an account of this to Pope Honorius :—the Pope, in his answer, approves of the conduct and doctrine of Sergius, and finishes his letter, by saying, “ Preach these things with us, as we preach them with “ you.” But the doctrine thus maintained by two Patriarchs and a Pope, was afterwards condemned by the 6th General Council in 682.—We therefore ask,—During the years which elapsed between the decree of Cyrus, and the condemnation of the 6th General Council, was it lawful for an Alexandrian, a Constantinopolitan, or a Roman to maintain the position in question, though most solemnly proposed to his faith by the highest spiritual authority of the country ?

We shall trouble your Lordships but with one more instance.

Your Lordships are apprized of the ravages which the heresy of Arius made in the Christian Empire ; in so much, that (to use the expression of one of the Fathers) the universe was astonished at finding herself become Arian.—How many Bishops, Archbishops, and Patriarchs,—how many Provincial Councils and Synods, authorized by their example and their decrees this unhappy heresy ! To complete the calamity, Pope Liberius yielded to it, by signing the

the confession of Sirmium, and abandoning St. Athanasius, whose cause was then inseparable from that of the faith.— Might not each of these unhappy Prelates have addressed their respective flocks in the language you have addressed us?—Might not they have said to them, “ We are the “ highest ecclesiastical authority of the district in which “ you reside : till our decisions are reversed by a still higher “ authority, it is your duty to submit to us ? ” But would this, my Lords, have justified the flock in obeying their decisions ? Would it have justified them in denying the divinity of Christ ? You see the consequence to which your position leads.—We are persuaded you will urge it no longer.

You may say, that in all the cases we have mentioned, if some Bishops and some Clergy maintained the unlawful propositions, there were other Bishops and other Clergy who opposed them. But is this not so with us ? Did not the late Vicar Apostolic of the London District approve of the Oath without the Alteration ? Has not the Vicar Apostolic of the Middle District approved of the Oath with the Alteration ? Have they not been joined by several of the Clergy, the most eminent for their learning, their piety, and other missionary endowments ? Is it not supported by most of the families, from whom religion, in this country, derives the greatest succours ? This is not the case of an individual acting in opposition to the Bishop. With so great a weight of authority against you, conciliation and instruction were particularly to be expected from you. Is it possible to suppose a case where they were more called for ? where there was less reason, or less right, to require that blind submission, you have required from us ? In short YOU have spoken,—the CHURCH has not.

Of the firm and conscientious adherence of the Right Reverend Vicar Apostolic of the Middle District, to his opinion of the lawfulness of the Oath, as it now stands, we have received the following HONORABLE TESTIMONY.

Dear Sir,

You request to know our opinion of what passed in the public conversation at Longbirch yesterday. We can have but one opinion.

“ Mr. T. Talbot, repeatedly in the most unequivocal
 “ manner, declared, that he approved of the Oath in its
 “ present form ; which form, agreeably to his own requisition,
 “ had been accepted in a public meeting on the 3d
 “ of February, 1790 : that, from that approbation he
 “ should not recede. That, when in a letter he lately addressed
 “ to Mr. Gibson, in London ; he spoke of having
 “ condemned the Oath, he meant the Oath as it was originally
 “ worded, for that he could not mean to say, he had
 “ condemned what he had publicly approved.—That he
 “ even lamented the measures in the condemnation of the
 “ first Oath, had been so precipitately conducted :—That,
 “ he thought it unnecessary at this time, to give any new
 “ formal approbation of the present Oath, because his former
 “ declaration, he knew, was on the minutes of the
 “ Committee, and must be publicly known. That, he apprehended
 “ besides, should he, (as we requested he would) give you a written
 “ approbation of the Oath, that it might still more irritate the
 “ minds of some men, and tend to widen the unhappy breach.—
 “ Finally, that he admired the temper, and great moderation of
 “ the gentlemen of the Committee, whose views he thought were
 “ most upright, and whose zeal to promote the cause of religion,
 “ and the interest of their Catholic brethren, merited the
 “ warmest commendation.”

Such

Such were Mr. Talbot's sentiments often expressed before us in the course of the day. And with regard to ourselves give us leave, Sir, on this occasion, to repeat to you our deliberate acquiescence in the words of the Oath; to lament the continuance of the opposition which is made to it; and to testify how much we applaud the general measures, which have been hitherto pursued by you, and the other gentlemen of our Committee, to obtain from Parliament a further redress of grievances.

With sincere regard, we remain,

Dear Sir,

Your affectionate and humble Servants,

Longbirch, Feb. 15. 1791.

Anthony Clough, Joseph Berington,
directed to the Thomas Flyn, Edward Eyre,
R. Rev. C. Berington. George Beeston.

My Lords, your pretensions to authority in the manner you have exercised it, being thus set aside, your Decrees must necessarily sink, into mere matters of private opinion, and have no more weight than they derive from the internal, or external evidence of their truth.

The objections to the Oath, we have so fully discussed in our former publication, that we shall now say little on the subject. But permit us, my Lords, to say, one great error pervades all we have had the honour to see in writing, or to hear in discourse from your Lordships:—*You conceive the words of the Protestation and the Oath, are to be understood in the meaning they might have in the language of the schools.*

Thus, my Lords, the words “a right to affect and interfere,” convey to your understandings, a right to affect and interfere by the spiritual operation of spiritual censures; and the word “persons,” appears to you synonymous

with the "souls or consciences." But no two things have less relation to one another, than the language of business, and the language of the schools. My Lords, it is indisputable, that an Oath must be taken in its plain and obvious sense.—Where a doubt arises on the plain and obvious sense of an Oath, it can only be ascertained by considering it in regard to the persons who propose it, the persons to whom it is proposed,—the subject of it,—and the end, to which it is intended to be applied. In the present case, every thing of this kind, is of a temporal nature.—It is proposed by the temporal power of the State;—to Catholics, in the civil capacity of subjects; with a view to their civil and social duties;—and in order to secure their fidelity to the State. All this is of a temporal nature. This, my Lords, is the test, by which the Oath ought to be tried, and its meaning ascertained.—Tried by this test, we appeal to your own judgments, whether any part of it will not be found perfectly harmless and unobjectionable?

The frequent instances of the imprudent interference of the ecclesiastical authority, since the Reformation, to impede the attempts of the Catholics, to obtain relief from the laws enacted against them, and the fatal consequences of those attempts, both in the case of religion, and on the persons and fortunes of Catholics, should, we think, have cautioned you against too much zeal on the present occasion.

In the eleventh year of queen Elizabeth, Pius Vth, fulminated his famous bull, *Regnans in Excelsis*, in which he not only excommunicated that Princess, but declared her fallen from her sovereignty, and her subjects absolved from their allegiance; and forbade them, under pain of anathema, to obey her laws. From this period, the English Catholics have to date the national odium and oppression,
under

under which, they have ever since laboured.—From this period it has always been asserted, that Catholics held principles inconsistent with a Protestant government; and that they could never reconcile the duties, which they owe to the supreme Pastor of their Church, with the duties which they owe to their temporal sovereign and fellow-subjects. This solemn act of the first Pastor, is always appealed to by their enemies, as an indisputable proof of the traitorous principles of the flock.

The Catholic body however, continued true to government, in opposition to Papal authority; and although some individuals published seditious doctrines, or attempted criminal practices, yet the body at large never suffered themselves to be infected, and remained at once steady members of the Catholic Church, and dutiful subjects to the sovereign powers of their country.—Many of the priests made the most solemn professions of loyalty and duty, notwithstanding any commands from Rome, to oppose or disobey their lawful Queen: Among the questions proposed to the missionaries by the government of this land, one was, whether they would obey and defend their Queen, although the Bishop of Rome should command them to disobey and forsake her.*

Thus the Catholics began to recover from the national odium, brought upon them by the unwise and unjustifiable bull of Pius the Vth. Under James Ist, many circumstances intitled them to expect a great degree of relief and toleration.—But they were destined to be thrown by another unwise and unjustifiable Brief, under an accumulated weight of odium. After the infernal horrors of the gunpowder treason, James the Ist. caused the Oath of Allegiance to be enacted in parliament, as a test, by which his loyal Catholics,

* See Mr. Dodd's Church History.

Catholics, who were attached to their duties as subjects, might be discriminated from those other Catholics, who were under the predominancy of a foreign Power.—The catholics in general, were ardent to take the Oath, and hoped by taking it, to restore themselves to their natural rights. Churchmen again interfered, and again blasted their hopes. Three successive Briefs of Paul the Vth. condemned the Oath of Allegiance, as containing many things contrary to faith and hostile to salvation. On every subsequent attempt made by the Catholics of England, to prove that their Religious principles were not inconsistent with the Civil government of their country, their efforts were quashed by these authoritative decisions.

In 1648, fifty of the most respectable noblemen and gentlemen of the English Catholics, subscribed the **NEGATIVE** of the following propositions.

I.

That, the Pope or Church, hath power to absolve any person or persons from their obedience, to the civil and political government established, or to be established in this nation in civil and political affairs.

II.

That, by the command or dispensation of the Pope or Church, it is lawful to kill, destroy, or do any injury to any person or persons living within the King's dominions, because that such a person or persons are accused, condemned, censured, or excommunicated for error, schism, or heresy.

III.

That, it is lawful in itself, or by dispensation from the Pope, to break promise, or oath, made to any of the aforesaid persons, under pretence that they are heretics.

In what manner did the subscription of the NEGATIVE of these propositions affect their faith as Catholics? Yet the authority of the Court of Rome was again brought forward to stop them. Several of their leading Priests were consulted, and among others the illustrious Holden, then the ornament of the English clergy, and among the most eminent of the Sorbonne divines; but on this, and on every occasion, the authority of Paul V. was held out, to deter the English Catholics from pledging their integrity as men and citizens.

Your Lordships have seen the Irish Remonstrance. It is as harmless and as free from objection as a profession of Allegiance can be. Yet it was censured: the Remonstrants were excommunicated, and several of them perished from want.—It adds to the harshness, not to say the cruelty of the interference of the Court of Rome upon these occasions, that by repeated declarations the Sorbonne, and other Universities of France, reprobated the doctrine of the Pope's *temporal* power, and while these proceedings of the *prosperous* Church of France were tolerated, the same proceedings were uniformly and severely condemned among the *afflicted* Catholics of England and Ireland.†—Thus on the one hand, the nation refused to relax the severity of the laws against the Catholics, till they disavowed the Pope's *temporal* power;—the Court of Rome and her delegates on the other, forbid their doing it;—and by interfering to prevent them, left them to confiscations, national odium, persecution, and death. Their last effort was an advantage taken of a difficulty arising on the word HERETICAL. The decisions of the Sorbonne, and the many luminous and unanswerable writings, by which the divines

† See Questions on the Oath of Allegiance, by a Catholic Gentleman in 1664.

and lawyers of France had vindicated the independence of their Sovereigns, in concerns of a *temporal* nature, had convinced every thinking Catholic, that the claim of the Court of Rome, either in a direct or indirect power in *temporals*, could not be supported; and Rome herself saw that the time was come, in which, to enforce it in the dominions of other princes, even by her spiritual censures, would be unwise and impolitic. Still she continued to assert it in her own dominions; and still the Bull in Cœna Domini, (*that eternal monument of the extent and extravagance of her claims and pretensions*;) was continued to be read on every Maunday-Thursday, within the holy walls of the Church of St. Peter. With these dispositions it is not to be supposed, she would permit, if she could hinder, an express disavowal of it by the English Catholics.—Their loyalty was however so strong, that, she found it impossible to restrain them from it any longer. When unfortunately the word *heretical* afforded a pretence for it. Such of her adherents as resided in the dominions of the Court, or in dominions under the influence of Rome, contended that the whole clause in James's Oath of Allegiance, by which the *deposing* power is denied was unlawful: some went so far as to say, the *deposing* power was every thing, but an article of faith. This would not be endured by English ears. In England, therefore, the doctrine was admitted to be unlawful: it was styled a novel doctrine, a false, a scandalous, an impious, a detestable doctrine, which deserved to be rejected, with horror, by Catholics. This was allowed, but it was said, that it was not pronounced in terms *heretical*, by the scripture or any council. It was not, therefore, in the scholastic sense, of the word, *heretical*. From this it was inferred, that the Catholics could not swear it was *heretical*. This strange difficulty was held out as a terror, to restrain Catholics from avowing their fidelity to their King
and

and their country, and unfortunately had too powerful an operation.* But this last effort of ingenuity at length failed of effect. Twice the Sorbonne were consulted, and twice they determined, that, the Catholics might, nay, that they ought, to take the Oath with the qualifying term *heretical*.

At length in 1682, came out the famous Declaration of the Gallican Clergy.

From that time sincere English Catholics saw, that the difficulties of some of their ancestors, had been ill grounded, and that they had been, for near a century and a half, the victims of Papal encroachments upon the civil rights of their country. But an opportunity did not soon present itself of justifying their tenets: in 1775, a favourable prospect seemed opening for the relief of the Catholics of England and Ireland. It was then the Sorbonne was anew consulted by the Irish Catholics, and returned their answer, in perfect conformity with the declaration of the Gallican clergy in 1682, and with the answer of their own Faculty in 1680.

In 1778, when the prejudices of darker times were removed, the Catholics of England and Ireland embraced with ardour, an opportunity of declaring the purity and integrity of their Political Principles. Their Bishops cooperated. In vain had Paul Vth declared the Oath of Allegiance irreconcilable with Faith and Salvation:—in vain, had he forbidden the Catholics to take that, or any similar Oath:—in vain, had the authority of preceding Popes been urged to deter them:—in vain, had Cardinal-Protectors and Nuncios pretended, that, former attempts of securing Allegiance to Protestant kings against the powers of the Pope, was a corruption of Catholic faith; in vain, had they

* See Cressy's Apologetical Letter, and Stillingfleet's Answer.

asserted, that signing a pledge of Civil submission to Temporal government, would do more hurt than all the former persecutions of heretics.†—All this formidable authority vanished, when the Catholics were permitted by government, in an awful moment of the Empire, to declare their sincere, unfeigned principles. Their religious persuasion conscientiously attached them to the communion of the Catholic Church and Apostolic See, but as subjects and citizens, they knew no sovereign, and acknowledged no laws, but the Sovereign and Laws of their Country. We repeat, and we confidently repeat, that, with the exception of the epithetical qualification, the Oath of 1778 is virtually and in effect, the same as the Oath of Allegiance proffered by James the 1st.

If under Paul V. and Urban VIII. and Innocent X. and Alexander VII. the English and Irish Catholics had slighted, as they did in 1778, those decisions of authority, which extended its empire over temporal concerns, and therefore to objects not within its competency,—would they not have prevented the most dismal misfortunes to themselves and their posterity; and have rescued their Religion from the most slanderous and abominable reproach? Had the better spirit of 1778 prevailed under Paul V. how much would the hatred and oppression of Catholics have been diminished? In 1778 the unjust encroachments of authority were repelled, and the example then set will be our justification, at present, unless it be proved, that, in pledging our integrity, as men and citizens, to our country, we have really renounced some Articles of Catholic Faith and Communion.

The relief obtained in 1778 was extremely partial, and the Oath, then required by Government, though adequate

† See the Letters of de Veechiis Rospighosi and Barbarini.

to the purpose of securing our loyalty, in a critical conjuncture, was not deemed by the nation a sufficient test of our Social and Political Principles. Ancient animosities revived, and the remembrance of the horrors of 1780, will long bear testimony with what violence they burst forth. English Protestants still suspected, that, we maintained principles dangerous to society, and totally repugnant to Political and Civil Liberty. In every publication of alarmed zeal we were called upon, by our prejudiced fellow-subjects, to renounce these dangerous principles: we were defied to renounce them consistently with our adherence to the Catholic faith. Even moderate Protestants, who expressed a desire to extend to us the blessings of toleration, insisted on this previous renunciation of imputed principles.† When we were directed at a General Meeting to apply for a repeal of the penal laws, the first requisition from the Minister to us was to state the extent of the Dispensing power. For this purpose, the answers of foreign Universities were procured at his request. An instrument of Protestation was then presented to us, containing the objections of Protestants and the Answers, which they declared would be satisfactory. We were called upon to sign this instrument,—CLERGY AND LAITY, WE SIGNED. —Are there among us persons capable of receding from their signatures and prostituting their honor?

This Protestation was converted into the form of an Oath. Shall we refuse to swear, when called upon by our country, what we most solemnly protested under our handwriting? The violation of an oath may accumulate the guilt of perjury on prevarication; but veracity is equally sacred, whether a protestation be made upon honour,

† See the Preface to the 4th Edition of Comber's Friendly Advice to the Roman Catholics of England.

or upon oath. *Tantus in te sit veri amor, ut quidquid dixeris, id juratum putes*, was the exhortation of a Father of the church, and he must be destitute of christian sincerity, who thinks he is not equally bound to tell the truth without disguise, when called upon to make a *Solemn Affelevation*, as if he had an *Oath* officially tendered. To recede therefore from any part of the Protestation would be a flagrant violation of veracity; a criminal prevarication; a mortal wound to the integrity of Catholics, and consequently an everlasting confirmation of the prejudice of Protestants, that our religion permits us to use Duplicity and Equivocation. Is it into this dishonour we are exhorted, nay required, by your Lordships, to plunge? Does not authority exerted to effect this purpose, tend to destruction not to edification? and if such an authority were submitted to, would not an undue respect for the Ministers of religion involve the ruin of Religion itself? —Have your Lordships maturely weighed these momentous consequences?

In the Protestation what have the Catholics renounced in a body, which has not been uniformly declared by their best writers, to be only aspersions on our religion. Compare the Protestation with the writings of our best controvertists; compare it particularly with the standard works of Mr. Gother and the account of catholic principles; compare it with the declarations of Catholics long before the Reformation began; will not these respectable authorities prove, that our principles are the principles of the wisest of our ancestors? “Did not our ancestors
 “ever maintain, that the crown of England was a sovereign, imperial and independent crown? That the
 “laws of England could never be altered, but by the legislature of England? That all encroachments of foreign
 “powers, whether civil or ecclesiastical, ought to be re-
 “sisted,

“ fisted, and consequently, that the spiritual authority
 “ acknowledged by Catholics to reside in the Church,
 “ could not affect or interfere either with the prerogatives
 “ of the Crown or the personal rights of the subject.”

As to acknowledging *no infallibility in the Pope*, is it not expressly said, in the Catholic principles, that *this is no tenet of our faith*? but if no tenet of our faith, and we do not even believe it as an opinion, why should we be restrained from declaring, that we do not acknowledge it? especially, as it is the controul of this principle, which, above all other considerations, excites the diffidence of our protestant fellow-subjects. Your Lordships cannot but recollect the immortal Raport of the Bishop of Tournay*, before the clergy of France in 1682. The following passage must have arrested your attention.

“ Si cette infallibilité étoit bien fondée; il faudroit mourir
 “ pour la soutenir; et à quelque éloignement de l’église
 “ qu’elle porte nos freres séparés, il ne seroit jamais
 “ permis de la diffimuler. Mais, en verité, étant visible
 “ qu’elle n’est appuyée ni sur l’écriture, ni sur la tradition;
 “ et étant certain d’ailleurs, que rien ne retient si fortement les Protestans dans le schisme, que la prevention
 “ dans la quelle ils sont, que nous nous faisons un point
 “ de religion de cette infallibilité, de cette independance
 “ des canons, de cette monarchie absolue, & de cet
 “ enorme pouvoir, que quelques theologiens, de ces
 “ derniers tems, ont attribué, au Pape, contre ce que
 “ l’écriture, & toute la tradition nous enseignent, n’est il
 “ pas de notre devoir, & de notre charité pastorale, de
 “ tirer enfin le rideau, & de declarer nos vrais sentimens
 “ à toute la terre!?”

* Monsieur de Choiseul.

“ If

“ If this *infallibility* was well founded, it would be our
 “ duty to die for the support of it, and however great
 “ might be the distance from us, to which it forced those
 “ of our brethren who have separated from us, it could
 “ not be lawful even to dissemble it. But in truth it be-
 “ ing evident, that it is founded neither on scripture nor
 “ tradition, and it being also certain, that nothing tends so
 “ much to keep protestants in the state of schism, as their
 “ prepossession, that this *infallibility*, and this *indepen-*
 “ *dence of the canons*, this *absolute monarchy*, this *enor-*
 “ *mous power*, which some divines of modern times have
 “ attributed to the Pope in contradiction to gospel and tra-
 “ dition, are articles of our faith, do not our duty and our
 “ pastoral charity require from us to lift up at length the
 “ veil, and declare our real sentiments to the whole
 “ world ?”

Your Lordships well know, that many attempts have
 been made to extend the Pope's *infallibility* not only to
 dogmatical questions of faith, but even to particular judg-
 ments concerning facts ; so that, however erroneous or ill-
 grounded the judgments might be, still the Faithful were
 bound to honour them by their submission.

It was this extravagance that diminished the respect
 due to the authority of the Pope, even when moving with-
 in his own sphere as first pastor of the church, and un-
 doubtedly, carried to this excess, *there cannot be a more per-*
nicious doctrine than that of Papal infallibility. For if the
 Pope's judgment be irreformable, and he should, like
 Paul V. declare, that *an oath of civil allegiance is a*
violation of Catholic faith, to what dire extremities would
 the faithful be reduced ? They could not fulfil the double
 obligation imposed upon them by their Saviour, of render-
 ing to God what belongs to God, and to Cæsar what be-
 longs

longs to Cæsar : they could not be good subjects and steady Catholics.

In answer to this, it is said, that the Catholic confines the *infallibility* to matters merely of a spiritual nature ; and therefore, if the Pope undertakes to pronounce in concerns of a temporal nature, the Catholic, though he admits his *spiritual infallibility*, is under no obligation of attending to him. But then, says the Protestant, if the Pope assumes to pronounce a *temporal concern* to be a concern of a *spiritual nature*, is not the Catholic bound to submit his judgment to that of the Pope ?

Thus Cardinal Bellarmine is known to have been an advocate for the Pope's indirect power in Temporals, and to have held the contrary opinion to be every thing but heresy. He certainly has on his side numbers of Transalpine Divines. *Here then is an opinion of the most deleterious tendency; an opinion, which strikes at the root of all established government, yet pronounced by a Cardinal of unquestionable learning and abilities as probable in the highest degree, and approaching nearly to an article of faith.* Let us advance but one degree further, and suppose this Cardinal to be elected Pope, and to persuade himself, and to proclaim to the faithful, that the article in question is *of a spiritual nature, and of faith* :—the mischief is done.

All this to a Catholic may, and yet we cannot well see how it can, appear ideal. But to a Protestant it must appear possible, and when he reflects on the Acts of the Gregories, the Innocents, the Bonifaces, and the Pauls, and particularly on the famous Bull of Pius the Vth, that direful cause of the calamities of England, and the Bull of Sixtus Quintus, that direful cause of the calamities of France, it must appear to him highly probable. If therefore we do not believe the Pope to be infallible,
even

even in religious matters, without the consent of the Church, (and by the Protestation we have declared we do not,) why should we not, for the satisfaction of our Protestant countrymen, declare upon our Oath, that *we acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope*; and thus, by avowing our real sentiments on the principle itself, prevent every possibility of being suspected to hold the pernicious consequences which must necessarily follow, when the principle is extended to that undue and dangerous latitude, to which it has sometimes been carried? “Wonderful it is,” we say with Cardinal Turrecremata, “that, when the “Popes speak themselves of their own power with moderation, some little doctors, (*doctorculi*) exceeding all “bounds of reason in their adulation, seem to equal them “to God.” “Thus,” says Cardinal Cusa, “while they “exalt the Holy See too high, they in fact depress and “confound it.” Of these Pius the Vth used to complain, and said, they had done too much mischief to the Holy See. We finish with the words of Melchior Cano;—Those who rashly, and at all rates defend the Pope’s right of judgment on every subject, do not serve his cause. No lying, no adulation does Peter require from us;—*Petrus non eget mendacio nostro, nostra adulatione non eget.**

My Lords, we mean not to discuss with you every article of the Protestation. The Authors we have referred to are sufficient warrants. Nor is it a duty incumbent upon us, to enter into a justification of each separate position.—The instrument came to us signed by the greatest ecclesiastical authority among the Catholics of this kingdom. Were the body of our clergy, our bishops and our priests, ignorant of the grounds of their religion? Have they all concurred to sign away their faith?

* Vide Caron’s Dedication to Alexander VII.

There is but one observation more, that we will urge. The word HERETICAL, has been mentioned as inadmissible. You recollect the various decisions of Sorbonne and the other universities of France, against Sanctarellus and Malagola. The doctrine is declared novel, false, scandalous, contrary to the word of God, &c. Is it not then HERETICAL? Consistently with their former decrees, and with the doctrine of the Gallican Church, the Sorbonne hath twice, as we have already mentioned, assured the Catholics of these dominions, that they might abjure it, as HERETICAL. But why recur to foreign authorities? They have their Bossuet and their Choiseul: we have our Challoner and our Gothe. Both these respectable persons thought the proposition in question HERETICAL, otherwise they would not have placed the following curse, at the end of one of the most popular books of controversy among the English Catholics, "Curse
 " is he who believes there is authority in the Church, Pope,
 " Councils, or Priests, which can give leave to commit sin,
 " depose, or murder sovereigns, Amen."*

These, my Lords, are our principles. A detail of our proceedings we have inserted in our letter to the Vicar Apostolic of the London District, of the 2d instant, to which we refer. To the above effect we had the honour of expressing ourselves to the Vicars Apostolic of the London and Northern Districts, at our conference on Tuesday, the 8th instant. You, my Lords, bishops of Acanthos and Centuria, will recollect, that from the time of the opening of the business, you insisted on there being no necessity of giving the reasons of your censures.—But, upon being greatly pressed, you mentioned some of the passages you objected to; and a discussion ensued on the meaning of

E the

* Vide Papist Misrepresented, and Represented again. Ninth Edition.

the word, "Persons," which involved in it, the material question, whether the words of the Oath were to be taken in their *scholastic* or *ordinary* sense? You will recollect our offer to submit to the opinion of two civil lawyers, two common lawyers, and two Catholic lawyers, whether by the whole of the clauses respecting the right of interference, any thing could be meant to affect the rights of conscience, or the spiritual effects of spiritual censures? That you, my Lord, bishop of Centuria, desired it to be inserted in the minutes, that you gave no answer to this proposition; and you, my Lord, bishop of Acanthos, said you had no objection, but would not stand to their decisions, and wished the above construction inserted in the Oath †. Your Lordships will recollect, with what candor and harmony, with what a tendency to an amicable explanation, the

† Though the Vicars Apostolic did not accede to this proposition, it was afterwards thought adviseable to state a Case upon the point in question for the opinion of Mr. Hill, his Majesty's Premier Serjeant at Law, the first lawyer at the bar in point of office and precedence;—and confessedly inferior to none in legal learning, and particularly eminent for his profound knowledge of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Constitution of this Country. The Case and the Opinion are copied below.—It has been objected, that the point is of a spiritual nature, and none, therefore, but a Catholic Priest is capable of judging of it, and that the opinion of the lowest Priest in the Church is to be preferred to that of the most learned among the Laity, in spiritual concerns.

But this, surely, is not a fair statement of the matter. In the Case laid before the Serjeant, the question is not made on any point of doctrine. The divine commission and spiritual authority of the Church, and the spiritual headship of the Pope, are there expressly admitted to be tenets of the Catholic faith. The point stated for his consideration does not relate to their existence, or extent.

the discussion was going on, between Mr. Barnard, (of whose candor, explicitness, and moderation, we shall ever retain a most grateful remembrance,) on your side, and

E 2

Sir

extent. The question submitted to him is, Whether the words of the Oath are intended to amount to a denial of this *spiritual* authority and supremacy,—or to be confined to a denial of the Church having a right to interfere in *temporal* concerns, or to use *temporal* means to enforce her *spiritual* censures? When the import of a legislative Act is fixed, a Priest may judge of its casuistry;—but while a doubt arises on its import and meaning, the legislature must be the only judge of its own meaning and intention; and till the legislature speaks, those are the best judges of them, who, by their studies, habits of life, and official situations, are most conversant with, and must be therefore supposed to understand best, the language of the legislature.

The assertion, that the opinion of the lowest Priest in the Church is to be preferred to that of the most learned among the Laity, in *spiritual* concerns, is, at least, questionable.—Even in the discussion of subjects merely *spiritual*, Religion has received, without a blush, the services of Laymen. Surely there have been Priests, whose opinions, or whose writings, are not to be preferred to those of Minutius Felix, Lactantius, the two Barclays, or even our own illustrious Woodhead.

T H E C A S E.

A DOUBT has arisen in the minds of some Catholics, whether some parts of the Oath, particularly the clause in red ink, do not amount to a denial of the *Spiritual* Rights, with which, according to their religious tenets, the Church and her Ministers, and particularly the Pope, is invested.—As those of preaching the Faith—administering the Sacraments—ordaining the Ministers of the Church—punishing by *spiritual* Censures, &c.—If it

amount

Sir Henry Englefield on ours.—When you, my Lord, bishop of Acanthos, rose from your seat, and said, that all this discussion was of no consequence; the question was,

amount to a denial of the Pope, the Church, and her Ministers, being invested with the Rights of this nature, it is an Oath which a Catholic cannot take consistently with his religious Principles.

On the other hand, it is contended, that it is not meant to deny by the Oath any *Spiritual* Right of the Church, but merely the Right of the Church to interfere in *temporal* concerns, or to use *temporal* means to enforce her *spiritual* censures.

Two propositions are admitted on all sides.

The one, that the Church is invested with a complete authority in *spiritual* concerns; and a power to enforce that authority by the *spiritual* means of censures; and that the Pope is the *Spiritual* Head of the Church.

The other, that neither the Church nor the Pope have, either directly or indirectly, any *temporal* power in this kingdom.

THE QUESTION, therefore, is, Whether the Oath in question, and particularly that part of it, which is written in red ink, is a denial of the *Spiritual* Authority of the Church, or the *Spiritual* Supremacy of the Pope.

ANSWER.—No Form of Civil Government, nor any System of Laws was instituted by Christ or his Apostles, nor any Commission granted to their Successors to enforce the Christian Doctrine by *Temporal* Power. The Authority of the Pope and the Church is derived from them. The words of the Oath do not import a denial of their having this Authority: they only deny their having *Temporal* Power, or a Right to enforce their *Spiritual* Authority by *Temporal* Power. This is all the Party who takes the Oath, will, or can be understood

was, whether we would submit or not? This unexpected requisition, and particularly the mode and the time, in which it was made, struck us with astonishment, and we requested to have your requisition in writing. It was accordingly committed to writing, and we withdrew into another room to give our answer.

Your question was,

“ Whether the Committee intended to submit not
“ to proceed further in the business of the Bill, without
“ the approbation of the Bishops ? ”

To the above question our reply was,

“ We have the greatest respect for episcopal authority;
“ and are always disposed to obey its decisions, when
“ applied to proper objects, and confined within proper
“ limitation. But we say with St. Leo, *Manet Petri privilegium ubicumque ex ipsius æquitate fertur iudicium.*
“ The requisition of submission, made by the two Apostolic
“ Vicars, appears in the present instance not grounded in
“ equity. No proof of the proposed Oath's containing
“ any thing contrary to faith or morals, has been produced ;

stood to swear or to assert, when he swears, in the words of the Oath, *that they have no Jurisdiction or Authority, that can either directly or indirectly affect or interfere with the Independence, Sovereignty, Laws, Constitution, or Government thereof, or with the Rights, Liberties, Persons or Properties of the People of the said Realm, or any of them ;**—therefore, I think the Oath is not a denial of the *Spiritual* Authority of the Church, or the Supremacy of the Pope.

Lincoln's-Inn, February 18, 1791.

G. HILL.

* The words in Italics are those which were written in red ink.

“duced; and we cannot acquiesce in the requisition,
 “without continuing, encreasing, and confirming the
 “prejudices against the faith and moral character of the
 “Catholics, and the scandal and oppression under which
 “they labour in this kingdom. We therefore refuse to
 “submit to the above requisition, and we give your
 “Lordships notice, that we shall appeal from it to all
 “the Catholic Churches in the universe, and especially
 “to the first of Catholic Churches, the Apostolical See,
 “rightly informed.”

Signed by

CHA. BERINGTON.	STOURTON,
Jos. WILKS.	PETRE,
	H. C. ENGLEFIELD,
	JOHN THROCKMORTON,
	JOHN TOWNELEY,
	THOMAS HORNYOLD.

Notwithstanding this declaration, we still request, your
 Lordships to say, whether, you will suggest any addition
 or qualifying explanation, which can be admitted con-
 sistently with the instrument of Protestation, signed by
 the Apostolic Vicars, more than two hundred of the
 clergy, and almost every respectable Catholic in England,
 and we will exert our best endeavours in negotiating the
 admission of such an addition or qualifying explanation.

Signed by

CHA. BERINGTON,	STOURTON,
Jos. WILKS.	PETRE,
	H. C. ENGLEFIELD,
	JOHN THROCKMORTON,
	JOHN TOWNELEY,
	THOMAS HORNYOLD.

This

This our answer and request we delivered to your Lordships. After some further discussion, you, my Lord, bishop of Centuria, said you intended it should have been an amicable conference, and moved that the question and answer might be thrown into the fire. You, my Lord bishops of Acanthos and Centuria, were asked, if you would retract the requisition, and both refused to retract it.

Therefore, my Lord Bishop of Rama, Vicar Apostolic of the Western District;—my Lord bishop of Acanthos, Vicars Apostolic of the Northern District;—my Lord bishop of Centuria, Vicar Apostolic of the Southern District;—

YOUR LORDSHIPS HAVING BROUGHT MATTERS TO THIS POINT;

Convinced, that we have not been misled by our clergy;—convinced, that we have not departed from the principles of our ancestors;—convinced, that we have not violated any article of Catholic faith or communion;—WE, the Catholic Committee, whose names are here under written, for ourselves, and for those in whose trusts we have acted, do hereby, before God, solemnly protest, and call upon God to witness our protest, against your Lordships' Encyclical Letters of the 19th day of October 1789 and the 21st day of January last, and every clause, article, determination, matter, and thing therein respectively contained; as imprudent, arbitrary and unjust; as a total misrepresentation of the nature of the Bills to which they respectively refer, and the Oaths therein respectively contained; and our conduct relating thereto respectively;—as encroaching on our natural,

tural, civil and religious rights, inculcating principles hostile to society and government, and the constitution and laws of the British empire: as derogatory from the allegiance we owe to the state, and the settlement of the crown: and as tending to continue, encrease and confirm the prejudices against the faith and moral character of the Catholics, and the scandal and oppression under which they labour in this kingdom.—In the same manner we do hereby solemnly protest, and call upon God to witness, this our solemn protest, against all proceedings had, or hereafter to be had, in consequence of, or grounded upon, your Lordships' said Encyclical letters, or either of them, or any representation of the Bills or Oaths therein respectively referred to, given or to be given by your Lordships or any of you.

And, from your Lordships' said Encyclical Letters, and all proceedings, had or hereafter to be had, in consequence of, or grounded upon, the same, or either of them, or in consequence of, or grounded upon, any representations of the said Bills, or Oaths, or either of them, given or to be given by your Lordships, or any of you; we do hereby appeal, and call on God to witness our appeal, for the purity and integrity of our religious principles, to all the Catholic Churches in the universe, and especially to the first of Catholic Churches, the Apostolical See, rightly informed.

CHA. BERINGTON. STOURTON.

JOS. WILKS. PETRE.

HENRY CHA. ENGLEFIELD.

JOHN LAWSON.

JOHN THROCKMORTON.

WILLIAM FERMOR.

JOHN TOWNELEY.

THOMAS HORNOLD.

No. II.

*The Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation
and Declaration.*

I *A. B.* do sincerely promise and swear, That I will be
 “ faithful and bear true Allegiance to Majesty
 “ and I do
 “ truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify, and
 “ declare in my Conscience, before God and the World,
 “ that our Sovereign
 “ ful and rightful of this Realm, and
 “ of all other Majesty’s Dominions there-
 “ unto belonging: And I do solemnly and sincerely de-
 “ clare, that I do believe, in my Conscience, that not any
 “ Descendants of the Person who pretended to be Prince
 “ of *Wales* during the Life of the late King *James* the Se-
 “ cond, and, after his Decease, pretended to be, and took
 “ upon himself the Stile and Title of King of *England* by
 “ the Name of *James* the Third, or of *Scotland* by the Name
 “ of *James* the Eighth, or the Stile and Title of King of
 “ *Great Britain*, hath any Right or Title whatsoever to the
 “ Crown of this Realm, or any Dominions thereunto be-
 “ longing: And I do renounce, refuse, and abjure any
 “ Allegiance or Obedience to any of them: And I do
 “ swear, that I will bear Faith and true Allegiance to
 “ Majesty and
 “ will defend to the utmost
 “ of my Power against all traitorous Conspiracies and At-
 “ tempts whatsoever, which shall be made against
 “ Person, Crown, or Dignity; And I will
 “ F do

“ do my utmost Endeavour to disclose and make known to
 “ Majesty
 “ and Successors, all Treasons, and
 “ traitorous Conspiracies, which I shall know to be against
 “ : And I do faithfully and fully promise, to the
 “ utmost of my Power, to support, maintain, and defend
 “ the Succession of the Crown against the Descendants of
 “ the said *James*, and against all other Persons whatsoever;
 “ which Succession, by an Act intituled, *An Act for the*
 “ *further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the*
 “ *Rights and Liberties of the Subject*, is, and stands, limited
 “ to the Princess *Sophia*, Electress and Daches Dowager of
 “ *Hanover*, and the Heirs of her Body, being Protestants:
 “ And I do swear, that I do, from my Heart, abhor, detest,
 “ and abjure, as IMPIOUS and HERETICAL, that dam-
 “ nable Doctrine and Position, that Princes excommunicated
 “ by the Pope, or by Authority of the See of *Rome*, may be
 “ deposed or murdered, by their Subjects, or any other Per-
 “ sons whomsoever: And I do protest and declare, and do
 “ solemnly swear it to be my most firm and sincere Opinion,
 “ Belief and Persuasion, That neither the Pope, nor any
 “ Prelate or Priest, nor any Assembly of Prelates or Priests,
 “ nor any Ecclesiastical Power whatsoever, can absolve the
 “ Subjects of this Realm, or any of them, from their Alle-
 “ giance to his said Majesty: And that no Foreign Church,
 “ Prelate or Priest, or Assembly of Prelates or Priests, or
 “ Ecclesiastical Power whatsoever, hath, or ought to have,
 “ any Jurisdiction or Authority whatsoever within this
 “ Realm, that can, directly or indirectly, affect or inter-
 “ fere with, the Independence, Sovereignty, Laws, Con-
 “ stitution, or Government thereof, or the Rights, Li-
 “ berties, Persons, or Properties of the People of the said
 “ Realm, or any of them: And that no Person can be
 “ absolved from any Sin, nor any Sin whatever be for-
 “ given

“ given, at the pleasure of any Pope, or of any Priest, or
 “ of any Person whomsoever ; but that Sorrow for past
 “ Offences, Resolution to avoid future Guilt, and Atone-
 “ ment to God and the injured Neighbour, are indispen-
 “ bly requisite to obtain Forgiveness of Sin : And that no
 “ Breach of Faith with, or Injury to, or Hostility against,
 “ any Person whomsoever, can ever be justified, by Rea-
 “ son, or under Pretence, that such Person is an *Heretic*
 “ or an *Infidel* : And that neither the Pope, nor any Pre-
 “ late, nor any Priest, nor any Assembly of Prelates or
 “ Priests, nor any Ecclesiastical Power whatever, can, at
 “ any time, dispense with, or absolve Me from, the Obli-
 “ gations of *this* Oath, or of *any other* Oath, or of *any Com-*
 “ *pact whatsoever* ; And I do also, in my Conscience, de-
 “ clare, and solemnly swear, That I acknowledge no IN-
 “ FALLIBILITY in the POPE : And all these Things I do
 “ plainly and sincerely declare, acknowledge, and swear,
 “ according to these express Words by Me spoken, and ac-
 “ cording to the plain and ordinary Sense of the same
 “ Words, without any Equivocation, mental Evasion, or
 “ secret Reservation whatsoever : And I do make the
 “ afore said Protestation, Declaration, Recognition, Ac-
 “ knowledgment, Abjuration, Renunciation, Promise, and
 “ Oath, heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true Faith
 “ of a Christian. So help me God.”

No. III.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER.

CHARLES, *Bishop of Rama, Vicar Apostolic of the Western District*; WILLIAM, *Bishop of Acanthos, Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District*; and JOHN, *Bishop of Centuria, Vicar Apostolic of the Southern District*,

TO ALL THE FAITHFUL, CLERGY AND LAITY OF THOSE
RESPECTIVE DISTRICTS.

WE think it necessary to lay before you the following Articles and Determinations.

1st, We are informed that the Catholic Committee have given in, or intends to give in, a Bill, containing an Oath, to be presented to Parliament, in order to be sanctioned by the Legislature, and the Oath to be tendered to the Catholics of this kingdom.

2^{dly}, The four Apostolic Vicars, by an Encyclical * Letter, dated *October 21, 1789*, condemned an Oath, proposed at that time to be presented to Parliament, and which Oath they also declared unlawful to be taken. Their condemnation of that oath was confirmed by the *Apostolic See*, and sanctioned also by the *Bishops of Ireland and Scotland*.

3^{dly}, Some alteration has been made by the Catholic Committee in that condemned oath; but, as far as we have learned, of no moment; consequently the altered oath remains liable to the censure fixed on the former oath.

* Which is hereunto annexed Edit.

4thly, The four Apostolical Vicars, in the above mentioned Encyclical Letter, declared, that, *None of the Faithful, Clergy or Laity, ought to take any new Oath, or sign any new Declaration, in Doctrinal matters, or subscribe any new Instrument wherein the Interests of Religion are concerned without the previous approbation of their respective Bishop, and they required submission to those Determinations.* The altered oath has not been approved of by US, and **THEREFORE** cannot be lawfully or conscientiously taken by any of the Faithful of our Districts.

5thly, We further declare, that the Assembly of the Catholic Committee has no right or authority to determine on the lawfulness of Oaths, Declarations, or other Instruments whatsoever containing Doctrinal matters; but that this authority resides in the Bishops, they being, by Divine Institution, the Spiritual Governors in the Church of Christ, and the Guardians of Religion.

In consequence likewise of the preceding observations, we condemn, in the fullest manner, the attempt of offering to Parliament an Oath, including Doctrinal matters, to be there sanctioned, which has not been approved by us: and, if such attempt be made, we earnestly exhort the Catholics of our respective Districts to oppose it, and hinder its being carried into execution; and for that purpose to present a Protestation or Counter-Petition, or to adopt whatever other legal and prudent measure may be judged best.

Finally, we also declare that, conformably to the Letter written to the Catholic Committee by the four Apostolical Vicars, *October 21, 1789*, we totally disapprove of the Appellation of *Protesting Catholic Dissenters* given us in the Bill, and of three Provisoes therein contained, and expressed in the said letter of the four Apostolical Vicars.

We

We shall here conclude, with expressing to you our hopes, that you have rejected with detestation some late publications, and that you will beware of others which may appear hereafter. Of those, that have been published, some are schismatical, scandalous, inflammatory, and insulting to the Supreme Head of the Church, the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

+ Charles Ramaten,* V. A.
 London, Jan. 19, 1791. + William Acanthen,† V. A.
 + John Centurien,‡ V. A.

* Charles Walmesley, V. A. of the Western District.

† William Gibson, V. A. of the Northern District.

‡ John Douglas, V. A. of the Southern (or London) District.

Edit.

✉ *In Reply to the foregoing ENCYCLICAL LETTER, was published not only the general ANSWER of the Committee, which is reprinted above No. I.—But their Answer was also accompanied with a Vindication of the Committee from whatever Charges were brought against them, for their Proceedings, and whatever respected their own Conduct in the management of the Business, in a Letter (dated Feb. 2. 1791,) addressed,*

“ To the Right Reverend Father in God, JOHN,
 “ LORD BISHOP OF CENTURIA, Vicar Apostolic of
 “ the Southern District of England.”

This Letter is referred to above, in page 25, but being of a more private and personal nature, is not here reprinted. Edit.

No. IV.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER,

ADDRESSED

To all the Faithful, both Clergy and Laity, in the four Districts of England, by the four Vicars Apostolic, CHARLES RAMATHEN, JAMES BIRTHAN, THOMAS ACON, and MATTHEW COMANEN.

Dearly beloved Brethren and Children in Christ,

WE think it necessary to notify to you, that, having held a Meeting on the 19th of October 1789, after mature deliberation and previous discussions, we unanimously condemned the new form of an Oath, intended for the Catholics, published in Woodfall's Register, June 26, 1789, and declared it unlawful to be taken.—We also declared, that none of the Faithful, Clergy or Laity, under our care, ought to take any new Oath, or sign any new Declaration, in Doctrinal matters, or subscribe any new Instrument wherein the Interests of Religion are concerned, without the previous Approbation of their respective Bishop.

These Determinations we judged necessary, to the promoting of your spiritual Welfare, to fix an anchor for you

to hold to, and to restore peace to your minds.—To these Determinations therefore we require your submission.

Hammer Smith, October

21, 1789.

- + Charles Ramaten, * V. A.
- + James BIRTHAN, † V. A.
- + Thomas Aconen, ‡ V. A.
- + Matthew Comanen, || V. A.

* Charles Walmsley, Vicar Apostolic of the Western District.

† James Talbot, V. A. of the London District. (Since dead.)

‡ Thomas Talbot, V. A. of the Middle District.

|| Matthew Gibson, V. A. of the Northern District. (Since dead.)

Edit.

No. V.

No. V.

TO THE

HONOURABLE

THOMAS TALBOT.

MY LORD,

WE, the undersigned Catholic Clergy, residing in the County of Stafford, at a moment, when the minds of many seem agitated, deem it our duty thus to address your Lordship, that the motives, which already have influenced our judgments, and which, hereafter, may direct our *conduct*, be made known to you. But our *conduct*, at all times, shall be regulated by your prudent controul.

When the *Oath*, the present subject of controversy, first appeared, some difficulties, we own, arose in our minds.

But the liberty, we have enjoyed, under your gentle and judicious direction, permitted us to discuss those difficulties, with cool and temperate minds, uninfluenced by any views, but such as the love of Truth and Order presented to us.

We had taken the *Oath* of 1778, and a few months ago, in concurrence with your Lordship, we had signed our names to the *Protestation*, a solemn instrument, which lies before both Houses of Parliament. It seemed to us, that the *new Oath* did not materially differ from them.

G

Deliberately

Deliberately we compared them together ; and the result was, a conviction on our minds, that we who could take the *Oath* of 1778, and sign the *Protestation*, might admit the few *explanatory* words introduced into the *new Oath* ; for the Principle and obvious Tendency of the three instruments, in our judgments, were the same. We wish, however, for the peace of others, that the *Protestation* had not, in the slightest degree, been departed from.

At this time, an *Address* to the *Catholics of England*, from the Gentlemen of our Committee, was presented to us. We read it : and if any doubts had remained on our minds, they were now completely removed. It told us, in what sense the *Oath* was understood by the framers of it, and in what sense it would be proposed to us, by the legislature of the Country : That a *test* of *civil* and *social* Principles was alone demanded from us.

The names of Gentlemen were signed to this *Address* of great and high character, whose views to promote our good, we knew, had been most upright, and to whose exertions we felt ourselves much indebted. On the sincerity of their declarations we could rely.—But among them, my Lord, were the names of two Gentlemen, whose opinions to us must ever carry great weight. One, for his moderate and manly character, your Lordship had chosen to be our future Superior ; and the other, by his manifold endowments, commanded universal respect. Could we now, for a moment, suspect, that any thing adverse to the real interests of Religion was designed by such men ?

In the *Oath* then we see nothing demanded from us but a *renunciation of tenets*, which have been falsely imputed to our Church, and which its members have uniformly rejected : This, surely, every state has a right to demand
from

from its citizens; and it may do it in any form of words, provided their *legal* acceptation be duly ascertained. This, we are assured, is done, on the present occasion.

When the *Oath* declares, that the Church, or Bishop of Rome, neither has nor ought to have, any *Spiritual Authority*, that can affect, or interfere with the *Ecclesiastical Government* of this realm, *as by law established*, (which we conceive to be the only *verbal* deviation from the words of the *Protestation*,) we are told, that it is only meant to repeat more explicitly the proposition, which precedes it, and which all reject; and that, by the *Ecclesiastical Government, as by law established*, is understood a *branch of the Temporal Government* of the country. But with this temporal government, no *Spiritual Authority* can have a right to interfere. They are things of different orders, the respective spheres of which should never be confounded. The catholic tenet, which admits the *spiritual power* of the Pope, and which restrains it, *as such*, to things of a *spiritual nature*, is not meant to be affected. That power does not reach to civil concerns; nor can the Church enforce her laws by *temporal coercion*.

With regard to the new appellation of *Protesting Catholic Dissenters*, which has offended some: we know, that the statutes always adopt a discriminating language: and we are disposed to surrender, for a more just and appropriate name, the odious appellation of *Papist*.

As to the *Provisoes* of the bill, we think, we cannot dictate to the Legislature, how far their indulgence shall extend, and that still we must submit to restrictions.

Such, my Lord, is the candid statement of what has passed in our minds, and of our present conviction, which, motives, free from every party view, (and which Reason, we trust, and Conscience must applaud) have contributed to produce. Under this conviction, we judge the *Oath* not only to be lawful, but that we ourselves should merit repre-

hension, if, when called on by Government to give a test of our *civil* and *social* Principles, we should refuse to take it.

And now, MY LORD, we will express a hope that our example may conciliate the minds of others, and tend to give us back the blessings of concord.

With the greatest respect,

We have the honor to be

Jan. 25, 1790. Your Lordship's most obedient
and dutiful Servants,

ANTHONY CLOUGH. JOHN CARTER.

THOMAS FLYNN. JOHN CORNE.

GEORGE BEESTON. THO. SOUTHWORTH.

GEORGE MAIRE. EDWARD EYRE.

WILLIAM HARTLEY. JOHN WRIGHT.

JOSEPH BERINGTON. JOHN ROE.

THOMAS STONE. JOHN KIRK.

JOHN PERRY.

No. VI.

We whose NAMES are hereunto subscribed, CATHOLICS OF ENGLAND, do freely, voluntarily, and of our own Accord, make the following solemn DECLARATION and PROTESTATION.

WHEREAS Sentiments unfavourable to us as Citizens and Subjects, have been entertained by English Protestants, on account of Principles which are asserted to be maintained by us, and other Catholics, and which Principles are dangerous to Society, and totally repugnant to Political and Civil Liberty; it is a Duty that we, the English Catholics, owe to our Country as well as to ourselves, to Protest in a formal and solemn manner against Doctrines that we condemn, and that constitute no part whatever of our Principles, Religion, or Belief.

We are the more anxious to free ourselves from such imputations, because divers Protestants, who profess themselves to be real friends to liberty of conscience, have nevertheless, avowed themselves hostile to us on Account of certain Opinions which we are supposed to hold. And we do not blame those Protestants for their hostility, if it proceeds (as we hope it does) not from an intolerant spirit in matters of Religion, but from their being misinformed as to matters of Fact.

If it were true, that we, the English Catholics, had adopted the maxims that are erroneously imputed to us, we acknowledge that we should merit the reproach of being dangerous Enemies to the State; but we detest those unchristian-like and execrable Maxims; And we severally claim,

claim, in common with Men of all other Religions, as a matter of Natural Justice, That we, the English Catholics, ought not to suffer for or on account of any wicked or erroneous Doctrines that may be held by any other Catholics, which Doctrines we publicly disclaim ; any more than British Protestants ought to be rendered responsible for any dangerous Doctrines that may be held by any other Protestants, which Doctrines they, the British Protestants, disavow.

I. We have been accused of holding as a Principle of our Religion, That Princes excommunicated by the Pope and Council, or by Authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their Subjects, or other Persons.

But, so far is the above-mentioned unchristian-like and abominable Position from being a principle that we hold, that we reject, abhor, and detest it, and every part thereof, as execrable and impious ; And we do solemnly declare, That neither the Pope, either with or without a General Council ; nor any Prelate, nor any Priest, nor any Assembly of Prelates or Priests, nor any Ecclesiastical Power whatever, can absolve the Subjects of this Realm, or any of them, from their Allegiance to his Majesty King George the Third, who is, by authority of Parliament, the lawful King of this Realm, and of all the Dominions thereunto belonging.

II. We have also been accused of holding, as a Principle of our Religion, That implicit Obedience is due from us to the Orders and Decrees of Popes and General Councils ; and that, therefore, if the Pope, or any General Council should, for the Good of the Church, command us to take up Arms against Government, or by any means to subvert the Laws and Liberties of this Country, or to exterminate Persons of a different Persuasion from

us,

us, we (it is asserted by our Accusers) hold ourselves bound to obey such Orders or Decrees on Pain of eternal fire.

Whereas we positively deny, That we owe any such obedience to the Pope and General Council, or to either of them : And we believe that no act that is in itself *immoral* or *dishonest* can ever be justified by, or under colour that it is done, either for the good of the Church, or obedience to any Ecclesiastical Power whatever. We acknowledge no *infallibility* in the *Pope* ; and we neither apprehend nor believe, that our disobedience to any such orders or decrees (should any such be given or made) could subject us to any punishment whatever. And we hold and insist, that the Catholic Church has no power that can, directly, or indirectly, prejudice the rights of Protestants, inasmuch as it is strictly confined to the refusing to them a participation in her Sacraments and other Religious Privileges of her Communion ; which no Church (as we conceive) can be expected to give to those out of her Pale, and which no person out of her Pale, will, we suppose, ever require.

And we do solemnly declare, That no *Church*, or any *Prelate*, nor any *Priest*, nor any *assembly of Prelates or Priests*, nor any *Ecclesiastical Power whatever*, hath, have, or ought to have any jurisdiction or authority whatsoever within this Realm, that can, directly or indirectly, affect, or interfere with the independence, sovereignty, laws, constitution, or government thereof, or the rights, liberties, persons or properties, of the people of the said Realm, or of any of them, save only and except by the authority of *Parliament* ; and that any such assumption of power would be an usurpation.

III. We have likewise been accused of holding, as a Principle of our Religion, That the Pope, by virtue of his spiritual power, can dispense with the obligations
of

of any Compact or Oath taken or entered into by a Catholic; That therefore no Oath of Allegiance, or other Oath, can bind us; and consequently, that we can give no security for our Allegiance to any Government.

There can be no doubt but that this conclusion would be just, if the original proposition, upon which it is founded were true: But we positively deny, that we do hold any such Principle; “and we do solemnly declare, “that neither the Pope, nor any Prelate, nor any Priest, “nor any assembly of Prelates or Priests, nor any Ecclesiastical Power whatever, can absolve us, or any of us from, or “dispense with the obligations of any Compact or Oath “whatsoever.”

IV. We have also been accused of holding, as a Principle of our Religion, That not only the Pope, but even a Catholic Priest, has power to pardon the sins of Catholics, at his will and pleasure; and therefore, that no Catholic can possibly give any security for his Allegiance to any Government; inasmuch as the Pope or a Priest can pardon perjury, rebellion and high treason.

We acknowledge also, the justness of this conclusion, if the proposition upon which it is founded, were not totally false; “but we do solemnly declare, That on the “contrary, we believe that no sin whatever, can be forgiven at the will of any Pope, or of any Priest, or of “any person whomsoever; but that a sincere sorrow for “past sin, a firm resolution to avoid future guilt, and “every possible atonement to God, and the injured neighbour, are the previous and indispensable requisites to “establish a well-founded expectation of forgiveness.”

V. And we have also been accused of holding, as a Principle of our Religion, That, “Faith is not to be “kept with Heretics,” so that no Government, which
is

is not Catholic, can have any security from us, for our Allegiance and peaceable behaviour.

This doctrine, That "Faith is not to be kept with *Heretics*," we reject, reprobate, and abhor, as being contrary to Religion, Morality and common Honesty. And we do hold and solemnly declare, that no breach of faith with any person whomsoever, can ever be justified by reason of, or under pretence, that such person is an *Heretic* or an *Infidel*.

And we further solemnly declare, That we do make this Declaration and Protestation, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of the same, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever.

And we appeal to the justice and candour of our fellow-citizens, whether We, the ENGLISH Catholics, who thus solemnly disclaim, and from our hearts abhor, the abovementioned *abominable* and *unchristian-like* Principles, ought to be put upon a level with any other men who may hold and profess those Principles.

Signed by the Apostolic Vicars and their Co-adjutors, by almost all the Clergy, and by most of the Laity of any consequence in the Kingdom of England.

No. VII.

ABSTRACTS FROM THE OPINIONS OF
FOREIGN UNIVERSITIES.

ALTHOUGH the English Catholics had no need of the testimony of any School or University whatsoever, to authorize them to make the above Protest and Declarations; yet as some persons seemed to doubt whether any foreign Catholic university would give a formal approbation to certain points contained in their declaration relative to the *Pope's dispensing power*, and *keeping faith with Heretics*, at their request the following queries were sent to PARIS, DOWAY, LOUVAIN, ALCALA, SALAMANCA, and VAL-LEADOLID.

THE QUERIES.

1. Has the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England?

2. Can the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects from their Oath of Allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?

3. Is there any Principle in the tenets of the Catholic Faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping
faith

faith with *Heretics*, or other persons differing from them in *religious opinions*, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature?

**ABSTRACT FROM THE ANSWER OF THE SACRED
FACULTY OF DIVINITY OF PARIS TO
THE ABOVE QUERIES.**

After an introduction, according to the usual forms of the university, they answer the first query by declaring:—

Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome hath any civil authority, civil power, civil jurisdiction, or civil pre-eminence whatsoever in any kingdom; and, consequently, none in the kingdom of England, by reason or virtue of any authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence by divine institution inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to the Pope, or the Church of Rome. This doctrine the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained, and upon every occasion has rigidly proscribed the contrary Doctrines from her schools.

Answer to the second query—Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any person of the Church of Rome, can, by virtue of the Keys, absolve or free the subjects of the King of England from their Oath of Allegiance.

This and the first query are so intimately connected, that the answer of the first immediately and naturally applies to the second, &c.

Answer to the third query.—There is no tenet in the Catholic Church, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping *faith* with *Heretics*, or those who differ from them in matters of *Religion*. The tenet, that it is lawful to break faith with *Heretics*, is so repugnant to common honesty and the opinions of Catholics, that there is nothing of which those who have defended the Catholic Faith against Protestants have complained more heavily, than the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing *this tenet* to them, &c. &c. &c.

Given at Paris in the General Assembly of the Sorbonne, held on Thursday the 11th day before the calends of March 1789.

Signed in due form.

UNIVERSITY OF DOWAY.

Jan. 5, 1789.

At a meeting of the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Doway, &c. &c.

To the first and second queries the Sacred Faculty answers—That no Power whatsoever, in *civil* or *temporal* concerns, was given by the Almighty, either to the Pope, the Cardinals, or the Church herself, and, consequently, that

that Kings and Sovereigns are not, in Temporal concerns, subject, by the ordination of God, to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever; neither can their subjects, by any authority granted to the Pope or the Church, from above, be freed from their Obedience, or absolved from their Oath of Allegiance.

This is the Doctrine which the doctors and professors of divinity hold and teach in our schools, and this all the candidates for degrees in divinity maintain in their public theses, &c. &c. &c.

To the THIRD question the Sacred Faculty answers—That there is no Principle of the Catholic Faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with Heretics, who differ from them in religious opinion. On the contrary, it is the unanimous doctrine of Catholics, that the respect due to the name of God so called to witness, requires that the Oath be inviolably kept, to whomsoever it is pledged, whether Catholic, Heretic, or Infidel, &c. &c. &c.

Signed and sealed in due form.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN.

The Faculty of Divinity at Louvain, having been requested to give her opinion upon the questions above stated, does it with readiness—but struck with astonishment that such questions should, at the end of this eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned Body, by inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment

discernment of its natives. The Faculty being assembled for the above purpose, it is agreed with the unanimous assent of all voices to answer the first and second queries absolutely in the negative.

The Faculty does not think it incumbent upon her in this place to enter upon the proofs of her opinion, or to shew how it is supported by passages in the Holy Scriptures, or the writings of antiquity. That has already been done by Bossuet, De Marca, the two Barclays, Goldastus, the Pithæuses, Argentre Widrington, and his Majesty King James the First, in his Dissertations against Bellarmin and Du Perron, and by many others, &c. &c. &c.

The Faculty then proceeds to declare that the *sovereign power* of the state is in no wise (not even indirectly as it is termed) subject to, or dependant upon, *any other power*; though it be a Spiritual power, or even though it be instituted for eternal salvation, &c. &c.

That no man, nor any assembly of men however eminent in dignity and power, not even the whole body of the Catholic Church, though assembled in general Council, can upon any ground or pretence whatsoever, weaken the bond of union between the Sovereign and the People; still less can they absolve or free the subjects from their Oath of Allegiance.

Proceeding to the third question, the said Faculty of Divinity (in perfect wonder that such a question should be proposed to her) most positively and unequivocally answers—"That there is not, and that there never has
 " been, among the Catholics, or in the doctrines of the
 " Church of Rome, any law or principle which makes it
 " lawful for Catholics to break their faith with Heretics,
 " or others of a different persuasion from themselves in
 " matters of Religion, either in public or private concerns.

"The

" The Faculty declares the doctrine of the Catholics to
 " be, that the Divine and Natural Law, which makes it a
 " duty to keep faith and promises, is the same; and is
 " neither shaken nor diminished, if those with whom the
 " engagement is made, hold erroneous opinions in matters
 " of religion, &c. &c."

Signed in due form on the 18th of November, 1788.

UNIVERSITY OF ALCALA.

To the first question it is answered—That none of the
 persons mentioned in the proposed question, either in-
 dividually, or collectively in council assembled, have any
 right in Civil matters; but that all Civil power, jurisdic-
 tion and pre-eminence are derived from Inheritance,
 Election, the Consent of the People, and other such
 Titles of that nature.

To the second it is answered, in like manner—" That
 " none of the persons above-mentioned have a power to
 " absolve the subjects of his Britannic Majesty from their
 " Oaths of Allegiance."

To the third question it is answered—" That the Doc-
 " trine which would exempt Catholics from the obligation
 " of keeping faith with Heretics, or with any other persons
 " who dissent from them in matters of Religion, instead
 " of being an article of Catholic Faith, is entirely repug-
 " nant to its tenets."

Signed in the usual form,

March 17th, 1789.

UNI-

UNIVERSITY OF SALAMANCA.

To the first question it is answered—"That neither Pope, nor Cardinals, nor any assembly or individual of the Catholic Church, have, as such, any Civil authority, power, jurisdiction or pre-eminence in the kingdom of England."

To the second it is answered—"That neither Pope, nor Cardinals, nor any assembly or individual of the Catholic Church, can, as such, absolve the subjects of Great Britain from their Oaths of Allegiance, or dispense with its obligations."

To the third it is answered—"That it is no article of Catholic faith that Catholics are not bound to keep faith with Heretics, or with persons, of any other description, who dissent from them in matters of religion."

Signed in the usual form,

March 7th, 1789.

UNIVERSITY OF VALLADOLID.

To the first question it is answered—"That neither Pope, Cardinals, or even a General Council, have any Civil authority, power, jurisdiction or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, in the kingdom of Great Britain; or over any other kingdom or province in which they possess no Temporal dominion."

To

To the **SECOND** it is answered—"That neither Pope
 "nor Cardinals, nor even a General Council, can absolve
 "the subjects of Great Britain from their Oaths of Alle-
 "giance, or dispense with their obligation."

To the **THIRD** it is answered—That the obligation of
 keeping faith is grounded on the law of nature, which binds
 all men equally, without respect to their Religious opinions ;
 and, with regard to Catholics, it is still more cogent, as it is
 confirmed by the Principles of their Religion.

Signed in the usual form,
 February 17th, 1789.

No. VIII.

B I L L

T O

Relieve, upon Conditions, and under Restrictions, Persons called PROTESTING CATHOLIC DISSENTERS, from certain Penalties and Disabilities to which Papists, or Persons professing the Popish Religion, are by Law subject.

WHEREAS, by divers Laws now in Force concerning Papists, or Persons professing the Popish Religion, divers Penalties and Disabilities have been imposed on such Persons, on Account of certain Principles attributed to them, which are dangerous to Society, and repugnant to Political and Civil Liberty :

And whereas divers Persons, who according to the Laws now in being, are within the Description of Papists, or Persons professing the Popish Religion, do not hold, and have protested against, such Principles, although they continue

sinue to dissent, in certain Points of Faith, from the Church of *England*, and are therefore called *Protesting Catholic Dissenters*; and such Persons are willing solemnly to protest against, and to declare that they do not hold such Principles:

And whereas it is expedient that such persons as shall so solemnly protest and declare against their holding such Principles, although they shall continue to dissent in certain Points of Faith from the Church of *England*, should be relieved from the penalties and Disabilities to which *Papists*, or Persons professing the Popish Religion, or their Children, or Persons educated in the Popish Religion, are by Law subject, except as hereinafter is excepted:

May it therefore please your MAJESTY,
That it may be Enacted; And be it enacted by the KING's Most Excellent MAJESTY, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That from and after

the Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, hereinafter expressed, may and shall be administered by any of the same Courts, and may and shall be registered in the same Manner, and shall give the same Benefits and Advantages, and shall be and operate to and for the same Intents and Purposes whatsoever, as in and by an Act, made and passed in the Eighteenth Year of His present Majesty, intituled "An Act for relieving His Majesty's
" Subjects, professing the Popish Religion, from certain
" Penalties and Disabilities imposed on them by an Act

“ made in the Eleventh and Twelfth Years of the Reign
 “ of King *William* the Third, intituled “ An Act for
 “ further preventing the Growth of Popery,” is enacted,
 exprest, and declared, of and concerning the Oath
 thereby prescribed; and that, within Days after the
 last Day of *December*, in this present Year, One Thou-
 sand Seven Hundred and Ninety-one, and Yearly, from
 Time to Time, within Days after the last Day of
December in every subsequent Year, a true and perfect
 List of the Persons who shall, in the preceding Year, have
 taken the said Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and
 of Protestation and Declaration, in any of the said Courts,
 shall be returned in Writing to the Clerk or Clerks of
 His Majesty’s Privy Council, by the Officers of such
 Courts respectively, whose Duty it shall be to keep the
 Register of such Oaths, according to the said Act of the
 Eighteenth Year of His present Majesty; and that in
 every such List, the Quality, Condition, Title, and Place
 of Abode of each Person who shall have taken the said
 Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation
 and Declaration, within the preceding Year, shall be
 fully and clearly exprest; and such Officers shall respect-
 ively give to every Person who shall take such Oath of
 Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and De-
 claration, upon his or her Demand, whether made imme-
 diately after taking such Oath, or at any other Time or
 Times, a full Certificate of his or her having taken the
 same Oath, and of the Day on which the same Oath shall
 be taken, for which Certificate there shall be paid no
 greater Fee or Reward than
 and every such Certificate shall be signed by the Officer
 giving the same, and shall be granted, upon the same
 Terms, to any other Person or Persons who shall demand
 the

the same; and every such Certificate, being so signed, shall be Evidence of the taking of such Oath, in all Courts of Justice, and to and for all Intents and Purposes whatsoever.

And be it further Enacted, That the Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, so authorized to be administered and taken as aforesaid, shall be in the Words following; (that is to say)

" I *A. B.* do truly and sincerely acknowledge,
 " profess, testify, and declare, in my Conscience,
 " before God and the World, That our Sovereign
 " Lord King *is* lawful and right-
 " ful of this Realm, and all
 " other Majesty's Dominions thereunto
 " belonging: And I do solemnly and sincerely
 " declare, that I do believe in my Conscience that
 " not any of the Descendants of the Person who
 " pretended to be Prince of *Wales* during the
 " Life of the late King *James* the Second, and
 " after his Decease pretended to be, and took
 " upon himself the Stile and Title of, King of
 " *England*, by the Name of *James* the Third,
 " or of *Scotland* by the Name of *James* the
 " Eighth, or the Stile and Title of King of
 " *Great Britain*, hath any Right or Title what-
 " soever to the Crown of this Realm, or any
 " Dominions thereunto belonging: And I do
 " renounce, refuse, and abjure any Allegiance or
 " Obedience to any of them: And I do swear,
 " that I will bear Faith and true Allegiance to
 " Majesty and will
 " defend, to the utmost of my Power, against
 " all traiterous Conspiracies and Attempts whatso-
 " ever, which shall be made against

" Person,

" Person, Crown, or Dignity; and I will do my
 " utmost Endeavour to disclose and make known
 " to Majesty
 " and Successors, all Treasons and
 " traiterous Conspiracies which I shall know to
 " be against And I do faith-
 " fully and fully promise, to the utmost of my
 " Power, to support, maintain, and defend the
 " Succession of the Crown against the Descen-
 " dants of the said *James*, and against all other
 " Persons whatsoever, which Succession, by an
 " Act, intituled, " An Act for the further Limita-
 " tion of the Crown, and better securing the
 " Rights and Liberties of the Subject," is and
 " stands limited to the Princess *Sophia*, Electress
 " and Dutches Dowager of *Hanover*, and the
 " Heirs of her Body, being Protestants: And I
 " do swear, that I do from my Heart abhor,
 " detest, and abjure, as *unchristian and impious*,
 " that damnable Doctrine and Position, that
 " Princes excommunicated or deprived by the
 " Pope, or by Authority of the See of *Rome*,
 " may be deposed or murdered by their Subjects,
 " or any other Persons whatsoever: And I do
 " protest and declare, and do solemnly swear it
 " to be my most firm and sincere Opinion, Belief,
 " and Persuasion, that neither the Pope, nor any
 " Prelate or Priest, nor any Assembly of Prelates
 " or Priests, nor any Ecclesiastical Power what-
 " soever, can absolve the Subjects of this Realm,
 " or any of them, from their Allegiance to
 " said Majesty; and that no Foreign
 " Church, Prelate, or Priest, or Assembly of
 " Prelates or Priests, or Ecclesiastical Power what-
 " soever

"soever, hath, or ought to have, any Juris-
 "diction, or Authority whatsoever, within this
 "Realm, that can directly or indirectly affect or
 "interfere with the Independence, Sovereignty,
 "Laws, Constitution, or Government thereof,
 "or the Rights, Liberties, Persons, or Properties
 "of the People of the said Realm, or any of
 "them: And that no Person can be absolved
 "from any Sin, nor any Sin whatever be for-
 "given, without Sorrow for past Offences, and
 "Resolution to avoid future Guilt; and that no
 "Breach of Faith with, or Injury to, or Hostility
 "against, any Person whomsoever, can ever be
 "justified by Reason or under Pretence that such
 "Person is an *Heretic*, or an *Infidel*; and that
 "neither the Pope, nor any Prelate, nor any
 "Priest, nor any Assembly of Prelates or Priests,
 "nor any Ecclesiastical Power whatever, can at
 "any Time dispense with, or absolve me from
 "the Obligations of, this Oath, or of any other
 "Oath, Contract, Promise, Engagement, or Com-
 "pact, whatsoever, made to or with any Person or
 "Persons whomsoever: And I do also in my Con-
 "science declare and solemnly swear, that I ac-
 "knowledge no *Infallibility* in the Pope: And
 "all these Things I do plainly and sincerely de-
 "clare, acknowledge, and swear, according to
 "these express Words by me spoken, and accord-
 "ing to the plain and ordinary Sense of the same
 "Words, without any Equivocation, mental
 "Evasion, or secret Reservation whatsoever:
 "And I do make the aforesaid Protestation, De-
 "claration, Recognition, Acknowledgment, Ab-
 "juration, Renunciation, Promise, and Oath,
 "heartily,

“ heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true
 “ Faith of a Christian.

“ So help me GOD.”

And be it further Enacted, That the Blanks in the said Oath shall be filled up, as the Case shall require, with the Name of His Majesty King George the Third, or of Him or Her who shall, by virtue of the said Act for Limitation of the Crown, for better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, be King or Queen of *Great Britain* for the Time being, and with the Word “ King” or “ Queen,” and with the word “ His” or “ Her,” as the Case shall be.

And be it further Enacted, That every Person who, after the making and passing of this Act, shall take and subscribe the Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, hereinbefore appointed to be taken and subscribed, shall thenceforth be deemed and taken in Law to be a “ *Professing Catholic Dissenter* ;” and that none of the Laws now in Force against or concerning *Papists*, or Persons professing the Popish Religion; or against or concerning Popish Recusants; or against or concerning Popish Recusants convict; or against or concerning Persons educated in the Popish Religion; or against or concerning Persons reconciled to, or holding Communion with, the See of *Rome*; or against or concerning Popish Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, or Persons entering into or belonging to any Ecclesiastical Order or Community of the Church of *Rome*; or against or concerning Persons hearing or saying Mass, or being present at, or conforming to, or performing any Rite, Ceremony, Practice, or Observance of the Church of *Rome*; or against or concerning the being present at, or the preaching or teaching in, any Congregation, Assembly, Conventicle, or Meeting,
 under

under Pretence of any Exercise of Religion, in other Manner than according to the Liturgy or Practice of the Church of *England*; or against or concerning Persons not resorting or repairing to his or her Parish Church or Chapel, or some other usual Place of Common Prayer, to hear Divine Service and join in public Worship, according to the Forms and Rites of the Church of *England*, as by Law established; or against or concerning Persons keeping or having any Servant or other Person being a Papist or reputed Papist, or Person professing the Popish Religion, who shall not so resort or repair to his or her Parish Church or Chapel, or some such other usual Place of Common Prayer as aforesaid; or against or concerning Persons not taking and subscribing the Oath commonly called The Oath of Supremacy, or the Declaration commonly called The Declaration against Transubstantiation, or the Declaration commonly called The Declaration against Transubstantiation and Invocation of Saints; nor any Law requiring the Registry of the Names and real Estates, or Inrollment of the Deeds and Wills of Popish Recusants, or Papists, or Persons educated in the Popish Religion, or whose Parent or Parents shall be a Papist or Papists, or who shall use or profess the Popish Religion, shall extend, or be construed to extend, to any such Protestant Catholic Dissenter, who shall have taken and subscribed such Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, as aforesaid: And in all Cases where Persons are required to take and subscribe the Oaths commonly called The Oath of Allegiance, The Oath of Abjuration, and The Oath of Supremacy, or the Declaration commonly called The Declaration against Transubstantiation, or the Declaration commonly called The Declaration against Transubstantiation and Invocation of Saints, any such Protestant Catholic Dissenter as aforesaid shall and may,

at his or her Election, take and subscribe, in the Place of the same, the Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, hereinbefore mentioned and appointed to be taken as aforesaid; and such last-mentioned Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, may and shall also be administered and taken before the same Persons, and in the same Manner, and shall give the same Benefits and Advantages, and shall operate to and for all the same Intents and Purposes whatsoever (save as hereinafter is excepted and provided) as the aforesaid Oaths commonly called The Oaths of Allegiance, Abjuration, and Supremacy, or the aforesaid Declaration against Transubstantiation, or the aforesaid Declaration against Transubstantiation and Invocation of Saints, in the room of which it is intended to be hereby substituted.

Provided always, and be it further Enacted, That no Place of Congregation, or Assembly for religious Worship, shall be permitted or allowed by this Act, until the Place of such Meeting shall be certified to the Bishop of the Diocese, or to the Archdeacon of the Archdeaconry, or to the Justices of the Peace, at the General or Quarter Sessions of the Peace for the County, City, or Place in which such Meeting shall be held, and until the Place of such Meeting shall be registered in the said Bishop's or Archdeacon's Court respectively, or recorded at the said General or Quarter Sessions; the Register or Clerk of the Peace whereof respectively is hereby required to register the same, and to give a Certificate thereof to such Person as shall demand the same, for which there shall be no greater Fee nor Reward taken than the Sum of one shilling and that no Person in Holy Orders, or pretended Holy Orders, whether as Priest, or as a Minister of any other higher Rank or Order, shall perform any Ecclesiastical Function, or otherwise officiate in any such Place of Meeting

ing, until he shall have been licensed in Writing for such Purpose by

and until his Name, and his Description, as a licensed Priest or Minister, shall have been registered at the Quarter or other General Session of the Peace for the County, or other Division, or Place, in which such Place of Meeting shall be situate, by the Clerk of the Peace of the said Court ; who is hereby required to register such Name and Description accordingly, upon Demand by some Person producing such Licence, and Payment of

as a Fee or Reward, and shall give a Certificate thereof to such Person as shall from Time to Time demand the same, for which Certificate no greater Fee or Reward shall be taken than and no Priest or Minister of any Rank, in Holy Orders, or pretended Holy Orders, who shall officiate in any such Place of Meeting, without being so licensed and registered as aforesaid, shall be deemed to be within the Benefit of this Act, for any Purpose whatsoever.

Provided always, and be it further Enacted, That if any Assembly of such Protestant Catholic Dissenters as aforesaid shall be had in any Place for religious Worship, with the Doors locked, barred, or bolted during any Time of such meeting together, all and every Person and Persons, who shall come to or be at such Meeting, shall not receive any Benefit from this Law ; but, notwithstanding having taken the aforesaid Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, shall, from the Time of Conviction, be liable to the same Pains and Penalties, for such their Meeting, as if this Act had not been made.

And be it further Enacted, That if any such Protestant Catholic Dissenter as aforesaid shall hereafter be chosen or otherwise appointed to bear the Office of High Constable or Petty Constable, Churchwarden, Overseer of the Poor, or any other Parochial or Ward Office, and such Person shall scruple to take upon him any of the said Offices, in regard of the Oaths or any other Matter or Thing required by the Law to be taken or done in respect of such Office, every such Person shall and may execute such Office or Employment by a sufficient Deputy by him to be provided, that shall comply with the Laws on his Behalf; but the said Deputy shall be allowed and approved by such Person or Persons, in such Manner as such Officer or Officers respectively should by Law have been allowed and approved.

And be it further Enacted, That every Priest or other Person in Holy Orders, or pretended Holy Orders, being a Minister, Teacher, or Preacher of any Congregation of such Protestant Catholic Dissenters as aforesaid, who shall take and subscribe the aforesaid Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, in Manner hereinbefore prescribed, shall from thenceforth be exempted from serving upon any Jury, or from being chosen or appointed to bear the Office of Churchwarden, Overseer of the Poor, or any other Parochial or Ward Office, or other Office, in any Hundred of any Shire, City, Town, Parish, Division, or Wapentake.

And be it further Enacted, That every Justice of the Peace may, at any Time hereafter, require any Person, that goes to any Place of Congregation or Meeting for Exercise of Religion, certified and registered under this Act, to take and subscribe the Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, hereinbefore prescribed; and, upon Refusal thereof, such Justice of the Peace

peace is hereby required to such Person to
without Bail or Mainprize, and to certify
the Name of such Person to the next General or Quarter
Session of the Peace to be held for that County, City,
Town, Part, or Division where such person shall then re-
side ; and if such Person, so shall,
upon a Second Tender, at the General or Quarter Session,
refuse to take and subscribe such Oath of Allegiance and
Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, as afore-
said, such Person refusing shall be then and there recorded,
and he shall be taken thenceforth, to all Intents and Pur-
poses, for a Popish Recusant, and suffer accordingly, and
incur all Penalties and Forfeitures, as if this Act had not
been made.

Provided always, and be it further Enacted, That all the Laws made and provided for the frequenting of Divine Service on the Lord's Day, commonly called *Sunday*, shall be still in Force, and executed against all Persons who shall offend against the said Laws, unless such Persons shall come to some Congregation or Assembly of religious Worship permitted by this Act, or by an Act made in the First Year of *William and Mary*, and intituled " An Act
" for exempting their Majesties Protestant Subjects, dis-
" senting from the Church of *England*, from the Penal-
" ties of certain Laws."

Provided also, and be it further Enacted, That nothing contained in this Act shall extend, or be construed to extend, to give any Ease, Benefit, or Advantage, to any Person who shall deny, in his Preaching or Writing, the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, as it is declared in the Articles of Religion mentioned in the Statute of the Thirteenth Year of the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*.

And be it further Enacted, That if any Person or Persons do and shall, willingly and of Purpose, maliciously or

or contemptuously come into any Place of Congrégation, or Assembly of religious Worship, permitted by this Act, and disquiet or disturb the same, or misuse any Priest, Minister, Preacher, or Teacher therein, such Person or Persons, upon Proof thereof before any Justice of the Peace, by or more sufficient Witnesses, shall find Sureties of the Peace, to be bound, by Recognizance, in the penal Sum of and, in Default of such Sureties, shall be there to remain till the next General or Quarter Session, and, upon Conviction of the said Offence, at the said General or Quarter Session, shall suffer the Pain and Penalty of to the Use of the King's Majesty, His Heirs and Successors.

Provided always, and be it further Enacted, That no benefit in this Act contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to any Dissenting Catholic Ecclesiastic permitted by this Act, who shall officiate in any Place of Congregation or Assembly for religious Worship permitted by this Act, with a Steeple or Bell, or at any Funeral in any Church or Church Yard, or who shall exercise any of the Rites or Ceremonies of his Religion, or wear the Habits of his Order, save within some Place of Congregation or Assembly for religious Worship permitted by this Act, or in a private House.

And be it further Enacted, That no Dissenting Catholic Ecclesiastic, that shall make and subscribe the Oath aforesaid, shall be liable to any of the Pains or Penalties mentioned in an Act made in the Seventeenth Year of the Reign of King *Charles* the Second, intituled, "An Act for restraining Nonconformists from inhabiting in Corporations," nor the Penalties mentioned in the Act made in the Twenty-second Year of the Reign of King *Charles* the Second, intituled, "An Act to prevent and
" suppress

“ suppress seditious Conventicles,” for or by Reason of such Persons preaching at any Meeting for the Exercise of Religion; nor to the Penalty of One Hundred Pounds, mentioned in an Act made in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Year of King *Charles* the Second, intituled, “ An Act for Uniformity of public Prayers, and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, and for establishing the Form of making, ordaining, and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Church of *England*,” for associating in any Congregation for the Exercise of Religion, permitted and allowed by this Act.

Provided also, and be it further Enacted, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to exempt any such Protestant Catholic Dissenter as aforesaid from paying Tythes or other Parochial Duties, or any other Duties to the Church or Minister, or from any Prosecution in any Ecclesiastical Court, or elsewhere, for the same; or to repeal any Part of the Statute made in the Twenty-sixth Year of the Reign of his late Majesty King *George* the Second, intituled, “ An Act for the better preventing of clandestine Marriages,” or any Parts of any other Statute concerning Marriages; or to give any Ease, Benefit, or Advantage to any Person who shall, by Preaching, Teaching, or Writing, deny or gainsay the Oath of Allegiance and Abjuration, and of Protestation and Declaration, herein before mentioned and appointed to be taken as aforesaid, or the Declarations or Doctrines therein contained, or any of them; or to repeal or affect any Law now in Force concerning the Right or Succession to, or the Limitation of, the Crown; or concerning the Election of any Member or Members to serve in Parliament; or to enable any Person to sit in either House of
Parliament;

Parliament; or to be of his Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council; or to hold, enjoy, or exercise any Office Civil or Military, unless duly qualified in the Manner now required by Law; or to educate any Child a Papist; or to educate any Child of Protestant Parents a Protestant Catholic Dissenter.

Provided also, and be it further Enacted, That nothing in this Act contained shall make it lawful to found, endow, or establish any religious Order or Society of Persons bound by monastic or religious Vows, within these Realms, or the Dominions thereunto belonging; and that all Uses, Trusts, and Dispositions, whether of Real or Personal Property, which, immediately before the passing of this Act, shall be deemed to be superstitious or unlawful, shall continue to be so deemed and taken, any Thing in this Act contained notwithstanding.

Provided also, and be it further Enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That nothing in this Act contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to that Part of *Great Britain* called *Scotland*.

No. IX.

A List of the Publications, occasioned by the foregoing Subjects, &c. or connected with them.

- I. The Declaration and Protestation of the Catholics of England. [First printed on a broad Sheet; afterwards at the end of Lord Petre's Letter, mentioned below, No. 17, along with]
- II. Abstracts from the Opinions of Foreign Universities, &c. [Both these are here reprinted, No. VI. and No. VII.]
- III. Encyclical Letter of the Four Vicars Apostolic (dated Oct. 21, 1789.) [A single Sheet, here reprinted, No. IV.]
- IV. Charles Bishop of Rama, Vicar Apostolic, To all the Faithful Clergy and Laity in the Western District. (Dated Bath, Nov. 2, 1789.) [A single Sheet.]
- V. Circular Letter of the Committee, &c. to the Catholics of England. (Dated London, 25th Nov. 1789.) With the Heads of a Bill, and Form of an Oath, &c. as first proposed.—[No Title Page: in Quarto: given away.]
- VI. To the Honourable Thomas Talbot, &c. A printed Letter. (Dated 25th Jan. 1790.) Signed by fifteen Catholic Clergy of Staffordshire. [Single Sheet, here reprinted, No. V.]

L

VII. A

VII. A Pastoral Letter of Matthew Bishop of Comana, and V. A. &c. To all the Clergy, Secular and Regular; and to all the Faithful of the Northern District. (Dated Jan. 15, 1790.) Newcastle upon Tyne, printed: and sold by J. P. Coghlan, No. 37, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square, London, 1790. 8vo.

VIII. An Answer to the Bishop of Comana's Pastoral Letter, by a Protestant Catholic. (Dated Moorfields, Jan. 26, 1790.) London, printed for R. Faulder, Bond-street, and J. P. Coghlan, 1790. 8vo. 1s.

[N. B. There was another similar Publication, dated from Moorfields, which was afterwards suppressed.]

IX. A Dialogue between a Protestant Catholic Dissenter, and a Catholic; On the Nature, Tendency, and Import of the Oath lately offered to the Catholics of England. By the Rev. William Pilling. London, printed by Coghlan, 1790. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

X. A View of the Oath, &c. by the Rev. Joseph Reeves, 8vo.

XI. A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Joseph Reeves, on his View of the Oath, said to be tendered by the Legislature to the Catholics of England. By the Rev. William Pilling. London, by Coghlan, 1790. 8vo. 1s.

[IN the Spring of the Year 1790, died the Hon. James Talbot, Bishop of Bertha, and V. A. of the London District, and also Mr. Matthew Gibson, Bishop of Comana, and V. A. of the Northern. Mr. Charles Berington was recommended by a majority of the London Clergy to succeed the former, but Mr. John Douglas was preferred at Rome; and Mr. William Gibson was there appointed to succeed his Brother Matthew, without consulting the Majority

majority of the Northern Clergy; this occasioned the following Publications :]

- XII.** A Letter addressed to the Catholic Clergy of England, on the Appointment of Bishops, by a Layman. London, by Coghlan, 1790. 8vo. (Dated [June 12, 1790.]
- XIII.** The Clergyman's Answer to the Layman's Letter on the Appointment of Bishops. By the Rev. John Milner, F. R. S. (Dated Winchester, July 1, 1790) London, by Coghlan. 1790. 8vo. 6d.
- XIV.** Petition of the Ladies, Widows, Wives, Spinsters, &c. to the Right Rev. Right Hon. and Worshipful Committee appointed to guard and promote the Interests of the British Roman Catholics. [A single Sheet: in ridicule of the Election proposed in the Layman's Letter.]
- XV.** Considerations on the Modern Opinion of the Fallibility of the Holy See in the Decision of Dogmatical Questions. With an Appendix on the appointment of Bishops. By the Rev. Charles Plowden. London, by Coghlan, and Messrs. Robinsons, Paternoster-Row. 1790. 8vo. 2s. 6d.
- XVI.** Reflections on the Appointment of a Catholic Bishop to the London District: In a Letter to the Catholic Laity of the said District. By Henry Clifford, Esq. (Dated 4th December, 1790.) London. For Robinsons and Faulder. 1791. 8vo. 2s.

[Previous to several of the former, appeared the two following, occasioned by Bishop Horsley's Review of the Case "of Protestant Dissenters, &c." which he afterwards suppressed.]

XVII. Letter from the Right Honourable Lord Petre to the Right Reverend Dr. Horsley, Bishop of St. David's. (Dated March 22, 1790.) London, for Faulder, 1790. 8vo.

XVIII. A Letter to the Author of the Review of the Case of Protestant Dissenters, with a Short Address to the Bishop of St. David's. By Sir H. C. Englefield, Bart. (Dated May, 1790.) London, for Elmley, 1790. 8vo.

[The following Tracts, &c. relate to the preceding Subjects.]

XIX. Milner's Sermon for Consecrating Bishop William Gibson (V. A. of the Northern District, who succeeded his Brother Matthew, &c.)

XX. Plowden's Sermon for Consecrating Bishop Douglas, (V. A. of the London, or Southern District, who succeeded Bishop James Talbot.)

XXI. Bristol Sermon, &c.

XXII. Simkin to Simon, or Dr. Geddes's Bible.

XXIII. Britain's Principles of Christian Religion.

XXIV. Second Encyclical Letter of three of the Vicars Apostolic, &c. (Dated London, January 19, 1791.) [Single sheet. Here reprinted, No. III.]

XXV. Letter

XXV. Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, John, (Douglas) Bishop of Centuria. (Dated Feb. 2, 1791.) From the Catholic Committee, 4to. [No Title page, given away, along with the following, which was stitched up with it.]

XXVI. Letter to the three Vicars Apostolic, &c. from the said Committee, together with the Oath of Allegiance proposed. [This Letter and Oath, are here reprinted, No. I. and No. II.]

N. B. *IN forming the above CATALOGUE, the Editor had the Use of different Lists, not equally perfect, so that the Reader must excuse its Defects, and possibly some Pieces may have been wholly omitted.*

F I N I S.